

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-14 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are none. Claims cancelled herein are none. New claims added herein are none.

Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" or "Office" refers to the Office Action dated December 10, 2003.

Application

The application describes an improved Multiple-Original-Output ("Mopying") control technology for multifunction devices (MFDs). The term "Mopy" is short for a function often called "Multiple Original Copies", "Multiple Original Prints", or "Multiple Original Output". A Mopy-enabled device produces "Mopies," whereas a photocopier produces copies.

Generally, a Mopy-enabled printer is a printer that produces multiple original prints. Mopying a document reduces the amount of data sent to the printer, which provides a faster return to the application and reduces network traffic.

The technology described in the application enables a user at a computer to fully control and access the functions of a Mopy-enabled MFD. With this technology, the user fully controls the source (e.g. data and paper) for each Mopy of a Mopy job. Similarly, the user fully controls the destination (e.g. paper and communications) for each Mopy of a Mopy job.

Kobayashi

This reference describes a multi-function unit which includes a printer engine, a logical copying machine carrying out a copying process with respect to a recording medium by the printer engine, and a plurality of logical printers carrying out printing processes with respect to the recording medium by the printer engine. The logical copying machine and the logical printers carry out apparent parallel operations.

While this reference does describe the use of a multi-function device (MFD), it does not disclose the MFD being Mopy-enabled. In other words, the reference does not disclose its MFD being capable of producing multiple original prints from one job. Therefore, it is not Mopy-enabled.

Substantive Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections under §102

The Office rejects all pending claims under §102. For the reasons set forth below, the Office has not shown that anticipation (i.e., §102) exists. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

The Office's rejections are based upon the following reference:
Kobayashi: Kobayashi et al., US Patent No. 6,246,487.

Based upon Kobayashi

The Office rejects claims 1-14 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 1

The Office indicates that Kobayashi discloses all of the features of this claim. Applicant submits that Kobayashi does not.

Claim 1 recites (with emphasis added and the portions of the reference cited by the Office in brackets):

A multiple-original-output ("Mopying") control system for use with a **Mopy-enabled** multifunction device (MFD), [see Fig. 6] the system comprising:

- a source-selection determiner configured to determine a source selected for a Mopy in a Mopy job from multiple sources on the MFD; [see Fig. 2; col. 6, lines 40-50]
- a destination-selection determiner configured to determine a destination selected for a Mopy in a Mopy job from multiple destinations on the MFD; [see Fig. 6; col. 12, lines 48-67 and col. 13, lines 1-24]
- a Mopy-job formatter configured to format a Mopy job that includes source-selecting directions for at least one Mopy

1 in the job and destination-selecting directions for at least
2 one Mopy in the job; [see col. 12, lines 60-67 and col.
3 13, lines 1-17]

- 4 • a Mopy-job transmitter configured to transmit the Mopy
5 job to the MFD. [see Fig. 6, element 45; col. 13, lines
6 18-24]

7 On pages 2-3 of the Action, the Office indicates that Kobayashi
8 discloses all of the recited features. Applicant respectfully submits that
9 Kobayashi does not disclose, teach, or suggest a “mopy-job” and a “mopy-
10 enabled” MFD as recited in claim 1.

11 Applicant submits that the MDF of Kobayashi is not “Mopy-enabled.”
12 More specifically, it is not capable of producing multiple original outputs based
13 upon a single source sent to the MFD.

14 With the technology of Kobayashi, the user selects the format (e.g.,
15 faxing, printing, file rendering, etc.) which by default selects the corresponding
16 processor (e.g., fax processor 33, print processor 33, and filing processor 32) in
17 the MDF. That, in-turn, selects a destination by default.

18 Since claim 1 recites a “mopy-job” and “mopy-enabled” MFD, each job
19 consists of one original source (e.g., from paper or data) and multiple
20 destinations (e.g., outbound fax, printing, etc.). With Kobayashi, each job
21 consists of one original and that sent to one destination.

22 Kobayashi’s discussion of the print process (at col. 14, lines 1-64)
23 illustrates that Kobayashi does not disclose or consider Mopy-jobs and its MFD
24 is not Mopy-enabled.

25 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
its rejections.

1
2
3 Claim 2

4 Claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.
5 More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Kobayashi does not
6 disclose, teach, or suggest a "mopy-job" and a "mopy-enabled" MFD as recited
7 in this claim.

8 Applicant submits that the MDF of Kobayashi is not "Mopy-enabled."
9 More specifically, it is not capable of producing multiple original outputs based
10 upon a single source sent to the MFD.

11 Furthermore, the Office indicates that the multi-bin stacker 211 of
12 Kobayashi is a source. However, it is a destination. It receives the output.

13 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
14 its rejections.

15 Claims 3-5
16

17 These claims are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1
18 above. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Kobayashi does
19 not disclose, teach, or suggest a "mopy-job" and a "mopy-enabled" MFD as
20 recited in these claims.

21 Applicant submits that the MDF of Kobayashi is not "Mopy-enabled."
22 More specifically, it is not capable of producing multiple original outputs based
23 upon a single source sent to the MFD.

24 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
25 its rejections.

1 Claims 6 - 8

2 These claims are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1
3 above. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Kobayashi does
4 not disclose, teach, or suggest a "mopy-job" and a "mopy-enabled" MFD as
5 recited in these claims.

6 Applicant submits that the MDF of Kobayashi is not "Mopy-enabled."
7 More specifically, it is not capable of producing multiple original outputs based
8 upon a single source sent to the MFD.

9 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
10 its rejections.

11
12 Claims 9-14

13 The Office indicates that these claims are of similar scope as claim 1 and
14 therefore are rejected under the same rationale given for rejection of claim 1. If
15 so, then Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for the same reasons
16 given above for the allowability of claim 1.

17 More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Kobayashi does
18 not disclose, teach, or suggest a "mopy-job" and a "mopy-enabled" MFD as
19 recited in these claims.

20 Applicant submits that the MDF of Kobayashi is not "Mopy-enabled."
21 More specifically, it is not capable of producing multiple original outputs based
22 upon a single source sent to the MFD.

23 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
24 its rejections.

Conclusion

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 3-31-04By: 

Kasey C. Christie
Reg. No. 40559
(509) 324-9256 x232
kasey@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com